DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 258 SP 020 403

AUTHOR Brophy, Jere E.; Rohrkemper, Mary M.
TITLE Motivational Factors in Teachers' Handling of Problem Students.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for Research on Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO IRT-RS-115
PUB DATE May 82
CONTRACT 400-81-0014
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March, 1982).
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University, 252 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824 ($3.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aggression; Attitude Change; Discipline; Elementary Education; Individual Differences; Locus of Control; *Problem Children; Problem Solving; Role Perception; Self Concept; Socialization; Student Behavior; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Motivation; *Teacher Response; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

Several teacher motivation variables were examined for relationships to stategies teachers use for responding to problem students. During interviews, 98 elementary school teachers described general strategies to twelve types of problem students: (1) failure syndrome; (2) perfectionist; (3) underachiever; (4) low achiever; (5) hostile aggressive; (6) defiant; (7) passive-aggressive; (8) hyperactive; (9) easily distracted; (10) immature; (11) shy/withdrawn; and (12) rejected by peers. Teachers also discussed specific responses they would make to typical classroom events in which the twelve problems occurred. It was found that teachers whose role definitions stressed general student socialization (rather than a more narrow emphasis on instructing students in the curriculum) made greater efforts to help problem students and were more willing to make allowances for them. Data also indicated that teachers' responses to problem students were affected by causal attributions, teacher-versus-student ownership of problems, and by more specific motives arising from the impact of the students' behavior on teachers' needs, emotions, and values. In dealing specifically with hostile-aggressive students, teachers were found to react differently according to their motivation: (1) by personal concern for these students; (2) by a sense of personal responsibility to prevent students from developing into violent or criminal adults; (3) by survival concerns; and (4) by personal anger or irritation with hostile-aggressive students. (JD)

ED218258

Research Series No. 115

MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS IN TEACHERS' HANDLING OF PROBLEM STUDENTS

Jere E. Brophy
Mary M. Rohrkemper

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jere Brophy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Published By

The Institute for Research on Teaching
252 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

May 1982

Publication of this work is sponsored by the Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan State University. The Institute for Research on Teaching is funded primarily by the Program for Teaching and Instruction of the National Institute of Education, United States Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education. (Contract No. 400-81-0014)

SP 020 403

Institute for Research on Teaching

Teachers' thoughts and decisions are the focus of studies currently under way at Michigan State University's Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT). The IRT was founded in April 1976 with a $3.6 million grant from the National Institute of Education. A new grant obtained in 1981 from the NIE extends the IRT's work through 1984. Funding is also received from other agencies and foundations. The Institute has major projects investigating teacher decision-making, including studies of reading diagnosis and remediation, classroom management strategies, instruction in the areas of language arts, reading, and mathematics, teacher education, teacher planning, effects of external pressures on teachers' decisions, socio-cultural factors, and teachers' perceptions of student affect. Researchers from many different disciplines cooperate in IRT research. In addition, public school teachers work at IRT as half-time collaborators in research, helping to design and plan studies, collect data, and analyze results. The Institute publishes research reports, conference proceedings, occasional papers, and a free quarterly newsletter for practitioners. For more information or to be placed on the IRT mailing list please write to:: The IRT Editor, 252 Erickson, MSU, East Lansing, Michigan 48824.

Co-Directors: Jere E. Brophy and Andrew C. Porter

Associate Directors: Judith E. Lanier and Lee S. Shulman

Editorial Staff:

Janet Flegg, IRT editor
Pat Nischan, assistant editor

Abstract

Several teacher-motivation variables were examined for relationships to teachers' self reports of strategies they would use for responding to problem students. Teachers whose role definitions stressed general student socialization (rather than a more narrow emphasis on instructing students in the curriculum) made greater efforts to "reach" problem students and were more willing to make allowances for them, although they were not necessarily more successful in controlling or changing their problem behavior. Teachers in general were more oriented toward sympathy and attempts to help when they saw students as owning their own problems and as victims of forces beyond their control, but were oriented toward control and punishment when students were perceived as acting intentionally in presenting teacher-owned problems. In dealing specifically with hostile-aggressive students, teachers motivated primarily by personal concern about these students were the most generally sympathetic and help-oriented, followed by teachers motivated by a sense of personal responsibility to prevent these students from developing into violent or criminal adults. Teachers motivated primarily by survival concerns were oriented primarily toward reinforcing their authority status in the classroom and asserting control over hostile aggressive students. Finally, teachers whose motivation included personal anger or irritation with hostile-aggressive students were the least likely to help and the most likely to punish or expel these students.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Jane Smith, Janis Elmore, Carolyn Rettke, Jean Medick, Lonnie McIntyre, Susan Rubenstein, Stephen Katz, and JoAnn Hite who assisted in project planning and data collection, and Jane Smith, Lynn Scott, Patricia Linton, Caroline Wainright, Linda Ripley, and Sheba Dunlap who coded the data, Suwatana Sookpokakit and Neelam Kher who assisted with data preparation and analysis, and June Smith who assisted in manuscript preparation.

MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS IN TEACHERS' HANDLING OF PROBLEM STUDENTS[1]

Jere E. Brophy and Mary M. Rohrkemper[2]

This paper considers the role of teachers' role definitions and causal attributions, and of the personal characteristics of students and the types of problems they present to their teachers, in determining teachers' responses to students' problem behavior. The data come from the Classroom Strategy Study, a large scale investigation in which teachers' perceptions of and strategies for coping with problem students were elicited through open-ended interviewing and responses to vignettes. The Classroom Strategy Study was designed primarily to develop information about how elementary school teachers can cope effectively with students who are aggressive, defiant, withdrawn, or otherwise difficult to handle because of chronic personality or behavioral disturbances. In the process, this research has also produced information about individual differences in teachers' goals and strategies for dealing with problem students, and about how these goals and strategies are linked with differences in teachers' role definitions, beliefs, attitudes, causal attributions, and motives.

The data come from 98 elementary school teachers (54 in Lansing and 44 in inner-city Detroit) spread roughly evenly across grades K-6. The teachers were originally selected because they had at least three

---

[1]This paper was presented as part of a symposium entitled "New Directions in Research on Teacher Motivation," at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March 1982.

[2]Jere Brophy is a senior researcher in the IRT and director of the Classroom Strategy Project. He is a professor of counseling and educational psychology in MSU's College of Education. Mary Rohrkemper is an assistant professor in the Department of Human Development, Institute for Child Study, University of Maryland and a former IRT research intern.

years of teaching experience and had been nominated by their principals as either outstanding or average in dealing with problem students. They were each observed for two half-days prior to interviewing, so that interviewers could familiarize themselves with the contexts within which the teachers worked and could form their own opinions about the style and relative success with which teachers handled their classes in general and their problem students in particular.

Interviews focused successively on 12 types of problem student:

failure syndrome (low self-concept; expects failure; gives up easily),

perfectionist (to the point of intolerance of or overreaction to mistakes),

underachiever (alienated from or apathetic toward academic activities),

low achiever (limited ability; cannot keep up with the class),

hostile aggressive (toward classmates),

defiant (openly defies the teacher),

passive-aggressive (oppositional without being openly defiant),

hyperactive,

distractible (short attention span),

immature (for this grade level),

shy/withdrawn (to the point of unresponsiveness), and

rejected by peers (social isolate).

Interviews lasted an average of four hours, spread over two or more sessions. Teachers spent much of this time responding to open-ended questions about what they would do (and avoid doing) to cope with each of these types of problem student. First, however, the teachers read a series of 24 vignettes (two for each type of problem student) and described how they would handle the depicted situations

if they arose in their classrooms. The two vignettes depicting hostile-aggressive students are as follows:

> This morning, several students excitedly tell you that on the way to school they saw Tom beating up Sam and taking his lunch money. Tom is the class bully and has done things like this many times.
>
> Class is disrupted by a scuffle. You look up to see that Ron has left his seat and gone to Phil's desk, where he is punching and shouting at Phil. Phil is not so much fighting back as trying to protect himself. You don't know how this started, but you do know that Phil gets along well with the other students but Ron often starts fights and arguments without provocation.

For each of the 12 types of problem student, then, teachers described both their general strategies for dealing with the type of problem behavior in question and their specific responses to vignettes depicting typical classroom events in which such behavior is exhibited. Interviews were tape recorded, and the transcripts have been coded for presence or absence of various categories of perceptions of the student, beliefs about the causes and meanings of the student's behavior, strategies for controlling or changing the student, and associated goals, motives, and rationales. (For additional information about the study, see Brophy and Rohrkemper, 1981, Note 1, and Rohrkemper and Brophy, in press, Note 2).

The present paper reports correlations among selected codes from all teachers' responses to the vignettes, along with data from responses of a subset of 45 teachers to the interview dealing with general strategies for coping with hostile-aggressive students. We begin with the concept of role definition.

Teachers' Role Definitions

Teachers' role definitions are defined by the tasks or functions that teachers assign to themselves as necessary or appropriate to the performance of their duties as teachers. Teachers disagree in their

beliefs about what roles teachers should play and what the priorities should be among these roles. Two of the more generally recognized and accepted aspects of the teacher role are instruction (presenting academic content to students and supervising their mastery of it) and socialization (fostering students' personal mental health and adjustment, promoting good interpersonal and group relations, and preparing students to be good citizens in the society at large).

The teachers in the Classroom Strategy Study were asked to check which of the following best characterized their approach to teaching:

1. much heavier emphasis on instruction versus socialization,
2. somewhat more emphasis on instruction versus socialization,
3. somewhat more emphasis on socialization versus instruction, or
4. much heavier emphasis on socialization versus instruction.

Correlations of scores from this item with other data from the study revealed systematic differences between the 53 teachers who placed more stress on academic instruction ("instructors") and the 31 who placed relatively more stress on student socialization ("socializers").[3] In general, these correlations indicate that *socializers* are more oriented toward dealing with students' personal and behavioral problems than *instructors* are, but are not necessarily more successful in doing so. Correlations with observers' reports of teachers' typical socialization techniques indicate that *socializers* were relatively more likely to signal appropriate behavior or cue the students, to state rules and expectations, to use "I" statements and make personal appeals to their

---

[3]All relationships reported in this paper are based on correlations significant at or below the .05 level.

students, and to appeal to safety as a reason for requesting change in student behavior. *Instructors,* in contrast, were more likely to rely on techniques that involved less personalized interactions between them and their students. They were more likely to refer problems to the principal, the parents, or other resource people, and when they did intervene personally, they were more likely to cue or criticize students through rhetorical questions ("Is that what you are supposed to be doing?") or to rely on relatively impersonal problem-solving questions and techniques than to inject personal appeals and expectation statements. Even so, observers' reports of student failure to change behavior following teacher intervention indicated that this happened more often in the classrooms of the *socializers* than the *instructors*. Thus, the *instructors* showed an advantage on a measure of immediate impact of their interventions on students, although there was no significant difference between the groups on more general ratings (made by principals and observers) of teacher effectiveness at dealing with problem students.

Other data from the observers suggested that the *socializers* were likely to be ineffective in dealing with underachievers and to have difficulty achieving smooth transitions between activities. In addition, self-report data from the teachers indicated that *instructors* stressed the importance of the teacher acting as a fair and consistent authority figure while *socializers* stressed the importance of teacher attributes such as patience or love for children; that *instructors* tend to dislike underachieving students while *socializers* tend to dislike defiant or hostile-aggressive students; and that *instructors* are more likely to use peer tutoring or tutoring by older students for low

achievers in their classrooms, while *socializers* are more likely to use student seating strategies that involve keeping close friends separated from one another. These various findings all indicate that the *instructors* are concerned primarily with setting up the classroom as a learning environment and with interacting with students primarily in their roles as learners, whereas *socializers* are more oriented toward building personal relationships with their students and using these relationships to promote good personal adjustment and classroom conduct.

These differences in role definition also appear in the teachers' responses to our interviews and vignettes concerning problem students. One general difference to keep in mind is that although the teachers generally understood the vignettes and perceived the students portrayed in them accurately, the *instructors* were more accurate in identifying problem types than the *socializers* were. We do not know yet whether this difference occurred because the *instructors* simply read the vignettes more completely or accurately (suggesting that they have higher intelligence, or at least reading comprehension ability), or because the *socializers* projected their own associations on to the vignettes and then reacted to this projected material as if it were part of the original vignette and not their own interpretation of it (suggesting that the *socializers* may have stronger or more stereotyped views about problem students). We will follow up this question in subsequent analyses. For the moment, however, this difference in accuracy of perception of the vignettes reinforces some of the other findings reviewed above which suggest that the *instructors* may be somewhat more impressive or effective than the *socializers*.

Analyses of teachers' general tendencies in responding to the vignettes extend the pattern of differences seen by the classroom observers. *Instructors* were more likely to respond to the problems depicted in the vignettes with simple demands or imperatives, whereas *socializers* were more likely to elaborate upon these imperatives with attempts to deepen students' insight by providing more information or to socialize students' attitudes or beliefs. *Socializers* were also more likely to mention improvement in student mental hygiene or coping abilities as a goal of their response strategy, whereas *instructors* were more likely to confine their responses to controlling (undesirable) or shaping (desirable) student behavior.

Teachers' attributional responses indicated that *instructors* perceived the problems depicted in the vignettes as caused almost entirely by factors external to the teacher, and primarily by factors within the student. *Socializers* in contrast, were more likely to mention factors such as poor parenting or a generally poor social environment when explaining how students developed problem behavior, and more likely to acknowledge that some problems could have been caused at least in part by inappropriate teacher behavior.

Socializers were more likely to reward and less likely to punish problem students as part of their response strategy, although it should be noted that the punishments mentioned by *instructors* that contributed to this difference involved staying after school, making restitution, or being referred to the principal, and not physical punishment or other punitive reactions that might seem inappropriate. *Socializers* were

also more likely to make allowances for problem students by providing them with "kid gloves treatment" or other forms of support, and less likely to berate these students with global personal criticism. However, *socializers* were also more likely to publicly "diagnose" the behavior of problem students by making "I know what you're up to" statements and then elaborating upon them, and more likely to discuss the problem students' behavior during class meetings in an attempt to minimize peer support for the problem behavior or generate peer pressure against it.

In addition to these general tendencies in responding to the set of vignettes as a whole, there were differences between *instructors* and *socializers* in their responses to the two vignettes dealing specifically with hostile-aggressive students. Regarding the incident in which Tom steals Sam's lunch money, the *instructors* were likely to state that they would worry first about getting the class settled down and busy at some appropriate activity before attempting to deal with Tom and Sam individually, but the *socializers* were unlikely to express such concern about settling down the class. Also, if they succeeded in establishing that Tom had taken the money, the *instructors* would simply tell Tom to return it to Sam, but the *socializers* would have Tom give them the money, and then they would return it to Sam later (they feared that having Tom return the money to Sam directly might lead to another flareup of trouble between the two boys). Regarding the incident in which Ron is bullying Phil at his desk in the classroom, the responses of the *socializers* indicated that they were more likely than the *instructors*

to attempt to "reach" Ron through direct socialization. However, the *socializers* were also coded as less likely than the *instructors* to take actions to insure that the incident was solved for good and thus unlikely to flare up again later during recess or on the way home from school.

In general, then, the responses of the *socializers* to our vignettes are consistent with their expressed role definitions in that they indicate an orientation toward going beyond teaching-learning concerns in order to know their students as individuals and attempt to promote their personal adjustment and socialize their interpersonal behavior in addition to teaching them academic content. They clearly spent more time and effort trying to reach problem students than the *instructors* who usually concentrated on academics and confined their responses to problem students to the articulation and enforcement of expectations for classroom conduct. Good intentions are not enough, however, and the data indicate that the *socializers* were no more effective than the *instructors* at dealing with problem students, and may even have been less effective in some respects. Thus, measures of teachers' role definitions are tapping teachers' classroom style or orientation, and not necessarily their effectiveness. Theoretically, teachers who are highly effective in dealing with problem students should not only be willing and able to reach them through personalized individual counseling, but should also be able to perceive the students' behavior accurately, articulate and enforce clear expectations, and take action to curtail unacceptable behavior when talk alone does not seem to be effective. The latter skills were more characteristic of the *instructors*

than of the *socializers* studied in this research.

Causal Attributions

Recently, much attention has been drawn to the role of causal attributions in determining teachers' and students' reactions to student success and failure, and thus also determining students' achievement motivation and subsequent achievement performance (Weiner, 1979). Less publicized, but equally important, is the role of causal attributions for students' problem behavior in determining teachers' and students' reactions to that behavior (and thus determining the future course of that behavior). These applications of attribution theory have been developed from research on the circumstances under which people are willing to help others that may be in need (Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969; Weiner, 1980) and the conditions under which parole board members are likely to approve or refuse a prisoner's request for parole (Carroll & Payne, 1977). In general, these investigations indicate that people are likely to take a less blaming, more help-oriented attitude toward people with problems when those problems are attributed to causes outside of the person (the person is a victim rather than a perpetrator), when the person cannot control the problem behavior (so that the person does not bear responsibility and should not be blamed for the problem), and when the problem behavior is seen as unintentional (the person is not acting deliberately and is not seeking to bring about the undesirable outcomes that may result from his or her behavior).

These same relationships were seen in the responses of the teachers to our vignettes. To the extent that teachers saw the problem students depicted in the vignettes as victims of circumstances beyond

their control, the teachers' response strategies were likely to be oriented toward developing long term solutions to the students' problems, and likely to include attempts to instruct, socialize, provide advice or help, or enlist the assistance of others in supporting the students. In contrast, to the extent that problem behavior was attributed to causes within the students themselves and seen as reflecting deliberate choice made by students who could have acted otherwise, the teachers' response strategies were likely to concentrate on control rather than problem solving, and to feature blame, criticism, or punishment.

Problem Ownership

These relationships between teachers' causal attributions for student behavior problems and their strategies for responding to these problems interacted with aspects of the problems themselves, particularly the ownership of the problems. Based on the concept of problem ownership defined by Gordon (1974), the problems depicted in our vignettes were classified as primarily teacher owned, shared by the teacher and student, or primarily student owned. With teacher-owned problems, such as defiance, aggression, or underachievement, students are presenting the teacher with problems in the sense that they are frustrating the teachers' needs. With student-owned problems, such as low achievement, perfectionism, or being rejected by peers, the students themselves owned the problem in the sense that their needs are being frustrated. (Teachers do not own these problems in the sense that their needs are being directly frustrated, although of course most teachers will feel sympathy for such students and attempt to help them). Finally, with teacher-student shared problems such as failure syndrome, hyperactivity,

distractibility, or withdrawal, the problem involves frustration of the needs of both teachers and students. For example, the disruptive behavior of hyperactive students frustrates teachers' needs for an orderly learning environment, and yet also frustrates the needs of the hyperactive students themselves to feel accepted by their teachers and classmates.

Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981) reported that teachers' attributional inferences and response strategies to the problems depicted in the vignettes differed according to levels of problem ownership. Students presenting teacher-owned problems were perceived as capable of self control but as misbehaving intentionally. Given these attributions, most teachers were pessimistic about their ability to produce generalized improvement in the students' behavior, and their response strategies were often confined to terse demands for behavior change, with little explanation of underlying rationales and little emphasis on instruction about appropriate behavior. Goals were typically limited to short term control of the problem behavior, without emphasis on shaping more positive behavior or preventive/remedial attempts to reach long term mental health improvement goals by addressing possible causes of the problem. There was little use of rewards or supportive behavior but frequent reliance on punishment or threatening/pressuring behavior in response to these teacher-owned problems.

In contrast, students presenting student-owned problems were seen as victims of circumstances that they did not necessarily cause and in any case, could not control. Teachers expected difficulty in making significant changes in the situation, but nevertheless usually were willing to commit themselves to try to help these students and usually

expected their efforts to have meaningful effects on the students' lives if they succeeded. Teachers' responses in student-owned problem situations featured extensive talk designed to provide support, nurturance, and instruction, rather than merely attempts to control behavior through reward or punishment. Teachers frequently mentioned long term mental health improvement goals with these students, including attempts to improve their self-evaluations or to teach them coping techniques that would allow them to succeed in situations in which they were now failing.

Finally, teachers' responses to teacher-student shared problems fell in between these extremes and to some degree yielded a third distinctive pattern of attributions and response strategies. Teachers' goals for students in these shared problem situations were more varied, but they emphasized long term goals and attempts to replace current problem behavior with more appropriate behavior. Thus, the emphasis here was more on shaping new behavior than on producing insight or developing coping strategies. Apparently, this is because students presenting teacher-student shared problems were seen as acting unintentionally but perhaps carelessly, and thus as needing to learn self control. Thus, these students were often exposed to behavior modification activities, with high teacher involvement in the form of close supervision or provision of cues or other help. There was limited use of language for instruction or socialization, and more emphasis on environmental engineering, modeling, or shaping of student behavior without extended explanation. Rewards and praise were frequently mentioned for these students, but as a behavior modification strategy rather than an attempt to encourage or build close relationships with the students.

In summary, we find that the concept of problem ownership is very useful in classifying the types of problems that students present to teachers, and, in combination with the concepts of role definition and causal attribution, very useful for predicting teachers' probable responses to those problems. In general, teachers who favor the *instructor* role will be more sensitive and responsive to achievement related problems, and teachers who favor the *socializer* role will be more sensitive and responsive to students' personal and behavioral problems. To the extent that the problems are seen by the teachers as owned by the students themselves and caused by factors external to the students and beyond their control, the teachers are likely to respond with instruction, support, and other forms of help designed to achieve a long run solution to the problem. However, to the extent that students present problems owned by the teachers and are seen as acting intentionally and on the basis of their own personal predispositions, teachers' responses are likely to stress control rather than problem solving and to involve elements of blame, rejection, threat, or punishment. In combination, these factors imply that *instructors* will respond most negatively to underachievers who are apathetic toward or alienated from academic learning and students of any kind who persistently disrupt academic activities. In contrast, *socializers* will respond most negatively to hostile-aggressive and defiant students, or any students who reject their attempts to form close teacher-student relationships (cf. Brophy, Evertson, Anderson, Baum, & Crawford, 1981).

Teachers' Specific Motives in Dealing with Hostile-Aggressive Students

The data presented so far were based on teachers' responses to our vignettes. The study also included more open-ended interviews probing teachers' more general strategies for dealing with each type of problem student investigated. At this writing, data are available on the responses of a subsample of 45 teachers to questions about general strategies for dealing with hostile-aggressive students.

In addition to coding goals and strategies, as was done with the vignettes, we coded teachers' interview responses for mention of the motives that drive their behavior. Of the many motives mentioned or implied by the teachers, the following four appeared frequently enough to allow meaningful correlational analyses in this subsample of 45 teachers.

1. Survival/self interest (teachers' responses are seen as necessary for maintaining credibility or respect with the students or for avoiding the development of conditions that the teachers simply could not tolerate in their classrooms)

2. Concern about the student (teachers' responses flow from their concern about the problem students and a desire to help them overcome their problems)

3. Prepare problem students for life (teachers' responses flow from concern that problem students are headed for delinquency, criminality, or violence-ridden adult lives)

4. Personal anger/irritation (teachers' responses flow from personal dislike of or irritation with hostile-aggressive students)

Codes reflecting presence or absence of various goals and strategies for dealing with hostile-aggressive students were correlated with codes for presence or absence of these four motives (see Table 1).

The most complete pattern of correlates is for the motive of concern about the problem student (which was also the most frequently men-

Table 1

Correlations of Teachers' Strategies for Coping with Hostile-Aggressive Students with Presence of Various Underlying Motives[a]

	Motives			
Strategies	Survival, self interest	Concern about the student	Prepare student for Life	Personal anger, irritation
Try to socialize beliefs, attitudes		48	39	-29
Promote insight into own or peers' behavior	-26	45		-28
Explain or model how to cope with anger		40	27	-25
Prevention/environmental structuring				
Class meetings, peer pressure				
Promote good peer relations	-26		28	
Build relationship with student			25	
Directly express positive affect		42		
Sympathetic listening	-27	28	29	
Insist on commitment to change				
Be firm/enforce demands	36	-34		
Expel if necessary		-30	29	29
Stress long term prevention/cure	-33	76		-44
Goals				
Control/suppress aggression (only)	36	-55		37
Shape desirable behavior		28		
Instruct/train/model/help		28		
Teach student to cope with anger		26		
Diagnose and treat underlying cause	-29	42		
Promote insight	-35	57		
Appeal/persuade to change behavior		26		
Encourage/build self concept	-42	30		-38

[a] Based on responses from a partial sample of 45 of the 98 teachers. Correlations are shown only when $p < .05$

tioned motive). Positive correlates include all of the goals and most of the specific strategies involved in trying to help hostile-aggressive students by counseling them, promoting insight, diagnosing and treating underlying causes, providing encouragement, helping the students learn to control their anger, and attempting to promote change by socializing attitudes and shaping behavior. Negative correlates include confining goals to control or suppression of aggressive behavior without attempting to deal with the problem in a more positive way, along with strategies that stress firmness in enforcement of demands (including expulsion from school if necessary). Most of the strategies that did not correlate one way or the other involved attempts to manipulate the behavior of the students indirectly rather than dealing with them in more direct and personal ways. In general, then, teachers whose responses indicated concern about the personal welfare of hostile-aggressive students were likely to commit themselves to trying to change these students through a variety of strategies aimed at long term prevention or cure, and not mere short term control.

The motive of preparing hostile-aggressive students for life (preventing criminality or violence) did not correlate significantly with any of the goal categories but did correlate positively with the strategies of trying to socialize beliefs and attitudes, explaining or modeling how to cope with anger, promoting good peer relations, building a good personal relationship with the student, sympathetic listening, and expulsion from school if necessary. Except for the last item, this is a generally positive pattern, but less complete and somewhat more distanced from the student than the pattern for the "concern about the student" motive. As might be expected from the difference between the

two motives, this pattern suggests that the teacher is acting more out of a sense of duty or civic responsibility than out of a personal concern for the student, and the mention of expulsion if things do not work out suggests lesser commitment to see things through to a successful conclusion.

As with the positive motives of concern about problem students and desire to prepare them better for future life, there are interesting differences in the patterns of correlates with the negative motives of survival/self-interest and personal anger/irritation. The survival/self-interest motive correlates positively with the goal of controlling or suppressing aggression without including more positive problem solving goals, and positively with the strategy of firmness in enforcing demands. This motive correlates negatively with the goals of diagnosing and treating underlying causes, promoting insight, or attempting to encourage or build self-concept, and also negatively with the strategies of promoting insight, good peer relations, sympathetic listening, and a stress on long term prevention or cure. These negative correlates include most of the goals and strategies associated with an inductive/counseling/mental health approach to student socialization, whereas most of the non-significant correlates are goals and strategies associated with instructional or behavior modification/environmental engineering approaches. More fundamentally, however, the very fact that teachers coded for this motive even mention survival issues in the first place suggests that many of them were among the least sophisticated or effective in dealing with the problems presented by hostile-aggressive students. If so, the pattern of correlates associated with this motive may reflect at least in part a limited knowledge base or

skill repertoire rather than an emphasis on the *instructor* role over the *socializer* role or an emphasis on behavior modification/environmental engineering approaches over induction/counseling/mental health approaches to socialization.

The final motive, personal anger/irritation with hostile-aggressive students, correlates positively with the control/suppression goal and with mention of expulsion as a possible strategy. Also, it correlates negatively with the goal of encouraging or building self-concept and with the strategies of socializing beliefs or attitudes, promoting insight, explaining or modeling how to cope with anger, and stressing long term prevention or cure. Hostile-aggressive students are not as threatening to these teachers as they are to teachers concerned about their own survival in the classroom, as indicated by the lack of a significant correlation between the motive of personal anger or irritation with hostile-aggressive students and the strategy of being firm by enforcing demands. Yet, these teachers would be willing to expel hostile-aggressive students if they felt it necessary, and their negative personal reaction to these students apparently prevents them from doing much to help the students in positive ways.

The data in Table 1 tie in with data from other studies indicating that teachers' needs and students' personal characteristics will shape teacher-student interaction. For example, Cooper (1979) has argued that teachers need to feel that they can predict and control events in their classrooms, and that they are likely to be avoiding, controlling, and even punitive with students who threaten their sense of security. This is seen in the pattern of correlates for the motive of survival/self-interest in the present study. Theoretically, we might expect

teachers who mentioned this motive to become more concerned about hostile-aggressive students than about themselves, and more able to deal with those students in positive, problem solving ways, if they could receive help that would make them feel more secure in the classroom and more confident that they could try to reach hostile-aggressive students without risking loss of control.

In contrast, achieving significant change in the attitudes and behavior of the teachers who are personally angry or irritated with hostile-aggressive students would probably require counseling designed to help them to analyze and work through their feelings. Even where students are acting intentionally and under control (and thus are "blameworthy"), such teachers will have to learn to concentrate on behavior change, rather than blaming, in order to be effective.

Conclusion

Data presented in this paper indicate that teachers' responses to the behavior of problem students are mediated in part by teachers' role definitions and causal attributions, by teacher versus student ownership of the problem the student presents, and by more specific motives arising from the impact of the students' behavior on teachers' needs, values, and emotions. In combination with other factors such as the size and specific makeup of teachers' knowledge base and repertoire of skills for dealing with problem students, and teachers' assessments of the relative costs and benefits involved in various courses of action (see Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981 or Rohrkemper & Brophy, in press), these concepts should be useful in advancing our understanding of teachers' responses to problem students, and in suggesting effective intervention approaches.

Reference Notes

1. Brophy, J., & Rohrkemper, M. Teachers' specific strategies for dealing with hostile-aggressive students (Research Series No. 86). East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1980.

2. Rohrkemper, M., & Brophy, J. Teachers' general strategies for dealing with problem students (Research Series No. 87). East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1980.

References

Brophy, J., & Evertson, C., with Anderson, L., Baum, M., & Crawford, J. Student characteristics and teaching. New York: Longman, 1981.

Brophy, J., & Rohrkemper, M. The influence of problem ownership on teachers' perceptions of and strategies for coping with problem students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1981, 73, 295-311.

Carroll, J., & Payne, J. Eds.) Cognition and social behavior. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum, 1977.

Cooper, H. Pygmalion grows up: A model for teacher expectation communication and performance influence. Review of Educational Research, 1979, 49, 389-410.

Gordon, T. Teacher effectiveness training. New York: Wyden, 1974.

Piliavin, I., Rodin, J., & Piliavin, J. Good Samaritanism: An underground phenomenon? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 289-299.

Rohrkemper, M., & Brophy, J. Teachers' thinking about problem students. In J. Levine and M. Wang (Eds.) Teacher and student perceptions: Implications for learning. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum, in press.

Weiner, B. A cognitive (attribution)--emotion--action model of motivated behavior: An analysis of judgments of help-giving. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 39, 186-200.

Weiner, B. A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 3-25.